

REMARKS

The present after final amendment is in response to the Office Action dated August 9, 2005 in which the Examiner rejects claims 1-12. In response Applicant cancels method claims 1-5 amends claims 6-12 and adds new claims 13-25. The now pending 20 claims includes independent claims 6, 13, and 22.

Objections to the Specification

In paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objects to the originally filed specification since the Sections/heading are underlined. This Application was published February 24, 2005, with a publication number of US2005/0040192. In this publication the USPTO Publications Office has already corrected this problem such that the Sections/Headings are shown in capital letters and are not underlined. Therefore, Applicant believes that an amendment is not necessary since the corrections have been made by the USPTO and since the guidelines are suggestions and not required. However, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to advise Applicant as to whether a substitute specification should be submitted which would merely have the underlines of the headings removed on pages 1, 2, and 3 of the specification.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC 112

In paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Office Action, claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. In response, the structure of the base claim 6 is amended such that a belt clip attachment system is claimed which includes the personal electronic device and the belt clip knob. Claims 11 and 12 further limit the electronic device and the knob, respectively.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC 102

In paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Office Action, claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Michel (US6305588). Applicant has canceled the method claims 1-5. However, as discussed below in response to the rejections under

35 USC 103(a), Applicant asserts that the cited prior art does not anticipate the remaining independent claims 6, 13 and 22, and the claims dependent thereupon.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC 103

In paragraphs 7 and 8 of the Office Action, claim 2 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Michel in view of Lehtinen (US 6059156). However, since claim 2 is canceled, Applicant will address this rejection in the discussion below with respect to the pending independent claims 6, 13, and 22.

In paragraph 9 of the Office Action, claims 1-5 (canceled), 6-7, 9, 11, and 12 are rejected as being unpatentable over Michel in view of Cau (US 5,833,416). In response, Applicant has amended independent base claim 6 to comprises, among other things,

"the personal electronic device comprising a battery door with a recess and a plurality of pegs projecting outward from an interior wall of the recess".

Applicant asserts that the cited prior art does not teach or suggest this limitation such that the battery door of the electronic device also serves as the attachment point for a belt clip know. Also, the "pegs" of the Michel patent, as cited by Examiner are actually contained on the knob. In contrast, Applicant is claiming that the pegs are projecting from the recess. The Cau patent describes a fastening system that does not cure these basic deficiencies. That is Cau also does not teach or suggest a device having a battery door with a recess and a plurality of pegs that project outward from an interior wall of the recess. Similarly, Lehtinen discloses a connecting member 36 which slides into a holder. But Lehtinen does not teach the limitations of claim 6, and therefore does not cure the deficiencies of Michel and Cau. The remaining rejected claims are dependent upon the patentable base claim 6, and thus, Applicant asserts that these claims, *a fortiori*, are patentable over the cited prior art.

In paragraph 10 of the Office Action, Claims 8 and 10 are rejected as unpatentable over Michel in view of Cau and in further view of Wang. Wang describes an engagement member having a starburst configuration. However, Wang does not

disclose the limitations of the base claim 6 as discussed above. Therefore, Wang alone or in combination does not cure the deficiencies of Michel, Cau, and Lehtinen. And thus, because the base claim 6 is patentable over the prior art, Applicant respectfully asserts that dependent claims 8 and 10 are also patentable over the cited prior art.

The newly added claims include base claim 13 and dependent claims 14-21, and base claim 22 and dependent claims 23-25. Independent claims similarly claim, among other limitations, a recess in at least a portion of a battery door for accepting a knob for attachment to a belt clip. Thus, the inventions of independent claims 13 and 22 are not anticipated by the cited prior art. Also, since the cited prior art does not teach or suggest the limitations of the independent claims 13 and 22, these claims are patentable of the cited references.

Conclusion

Applicant asserts that the now pending claims 5-25 are patentable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests that the Examiner issue a notice of allowance for the now pending claims.

Respectfully Submitted,

By:


Kathleen L. Connell
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 45,344

Dated: December 9, 2005

KYOCERA WIRELESS CORP.
Attn: Intellectual Property Department
P.O. Box 928289
San Diego, California 92192-8289
Direct Dial: (858) 882-2169
Direct Fax: (858) 882-2485